IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| In re Application of: | |) | | | |
|-----------------------|--|-------------------------|-------|--------|------------------------|
| | | |) Co | nf. #: | 3739 |
| | 4 | Gang BAO <i>et al</i> . |) | | |
| | | |) Art | Unit: | 1618 |
| Serial 1 | No.: | 10/694,243 |) | | |
| | | |) Exa | aminer | : Dameron Levest Jones |
| Filed: | 4 | October 27, 2003 |) | | |
| | | |) | | |
| For: | MULTIFUNCTIONAL MAGNETIC NANOPARTICLE PROBES FOR INTRACELLULAR MOLECULAR IMAGING | |) | | |
| | | |) |)) | |
| | | | :) | | |
| | AND MONITOR | RING |) | | |

RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Jones for taking the time to conduct a telephone interview on December 28, 2007. Applicants' representative Kathryn Wade and Examiner Jones discussed the newly made restriction requirement and its timeliness. Applicants' representative and Examiner Jones also discussed the previous restriction requirement mailed November 19, 2005, Applicants' response to the same, and the Examiner's withdrawal of that restriction requirement. The status of the case also was discussed with respect to the claims that previously were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form, and with respect to the fact that the claim amendments submitted in the Response to Final Office Action did not affect the allowability of the claims that previously were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants' representative respectfully disagreed with the Examiner's assertion that the Patent Office had "advised of the necessary things needed to distinguish the

Thereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically, addressed to: Mail Stop: Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on January 28 2008

Kathryn H. Wade, Ph.D., Reg. No. 54,682

U.S. Serial No.: 10/694,243

Title: "Multifunctional Magnetic Nanoparticle Probes for Intracellular Molecular Imaging and Monitoring"

Filed: October 27, 2003

Response to Statement of Substance of Interview of December 28, 2007

Page 2 of 2

inventions over the prior art." Applicants' representative pointed out that although it is believed

that the cited prior art does not read on the present invention, Applicants have, in fact, amended

the claims in response to each rejection made by the Patent Office in the interest of advancing the

prosecution of this application. Agreement was not reached, and Applicants agreed to file a

response to the current restriction requirement.

If there are any issues which can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is

invited to call the undersigned attorney at (404)853-8000. No fees are believed to be due;

however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees due or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-5029.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn H. Wade

By:Kathryn H. Wade, Ph.D. Reg. No. 54,682

Attorney for Applicant

SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP

999 Peachtree Street, NE

Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3996

(404) 853-8000

SAB Docket: 17625-0058